

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/665,287	KUBO, NOBUAKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hai C. Pham	2861	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Hai C. Pham. (3) Surinder Sachar, Attorney.
 (2) Andy Harry, Attorney. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 August 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 12, 45 and 49.

Identification of prior art discussed: Toda (Pub US 2001/0017645), Ono (JP 2001-194613).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner confirms that a typographical error was made in the previous Office action with regard to the rejection of claims under 35 USC 103 over Toda in view of Ono, in which Ono was mistakenly not mentioned in the preamble of the rejection. The Applicant's Representative proposes to amend each of the base claims 12, 45 and 49 to include the pivoting point located at the middle of the optical element within the inclination mechanism, which would overcome the prior art in Toda. The examiner indicates that an update search would be needed.